

# **Virginia Administrative Dispute Resolution Act**

## **AGENCY COORDINATOR TRAINING**

**October 3, 2005**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Program Outline	3
Fact Sheet and Statute	4 – 9
Training Slides	10 – 28
Agency ADR Pilots	29
Guidelines for Dispute Resolution Coordinators	30 – 34
Forms of ADR (chart)	35
Principles of ADR Systems Design	36 – 38
Agency ADR Assessment and Planning Tool	39 - 40
Overview – Training Managers about ADR	41
Practical Tips for Management Representatives	42
Considerations for Case Selection	43 – 45
Reference Listing	46
Policy Statement	47 – 48
ADR Policy and Procedures Manual (sample template)	49 – 51
2004 Survey Data	52 - 58

THE  
VIRGINIA ADMINISTRATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION ACT  
Dispute Resolution Coordinator Training

October 3, 2005

**PROGRAM**

- Introduction
- Overview of the Virginia Administrative Dispute Resolution Act (VADRA)
- Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR): An Overview of Methods and Issues
- Shared Experiences
- Group Discussion
- Developing a Policy and Implementing a Program (discussion)
- Data Collection and Analysis (discussion)
- Discussion of resource materials
- Wrap-up and Evaluation

## FACT SHEET

### *Virginia Administrative Dispute Resolution Act* (Va. Code §§2.2-4115 through -4119)(became effective 7/1/02)

#### **The Act:**

- Encourages the use of alternative dispute resolution methods by local governments and state executive and legislative branch agencies across a broad range of governmental functions
- Requires each executive branch agency head to appoint an employee to serve as the agency's Dispute Resolution Coordinator
- Creates an **Interagency Dispute Resolution Advisory Council** within the state's executive branch composed of two Dispute Resolution Coordinators appointed by each Cabinet Secretary from the pool of Coordinators in his or her Secretariat; three private sector members appointed by the Governor; the Director of the Department of Employment Dispute Resolution; and as Chair, the Secretary of Administration
- Requires each executive branch agency to develop policies addressing its use of ADR

#### **The Interagency Dispute Resolution Advisory Council:**

- Provides guidance, training and consultation to state executive branch agencies in drafting and implementing their individual ADR policies
- Reports to the Governor and the General Assembly on the use of ADR in state agencies
- Recommends changes to the law as needed
- Web site: [www.vadra.gov](http://www.vadra.gov)
- Email: [vadra@edr.virginia.gov](mailto:vadra@edr.virginia.gov)

#### **Key Points for Agency Leaders:**

- **Think broadly.** State and local governments benefit from using proactive, problem-solving approaches to *prevent* unproductive conflict as well as alternative resolution practices such as mediation to *resolve* disputes that occur. Also, while all executive branch agencies have long had mediation coordinators in their HR departments for the workplace program provided by the Department of Employment Dispute Resolution, the Va. ADR Act is not just for employment issues. The Act applies to a wide range of government functions such as procurement and construction contracting, consumer protection, professional licensure, community planning, environmental, special education, and state regulated business franchises.

- **This will be a committed, steady, and evolving process.** The Council has provided guidance for agencies in developing their internal ADR policies and will serve as an ongoing resource for their implementation and further development. For the foreseeable future, one of the Council's top priorities will be laying a strong, stable foundation to assure that the Act's goals are met and sustained over time, throughout changing administrations. Long-term success will require planning, focus, and demonstrating to the Commonwealth's citizens the benefits of ADR in government.

**Virginia Administrative Dispute Resolution Act**  
**Va. Code § 2.2-4115 through -4119**

**§ 2.2-4115. Definitions.**

As used in this chapter, unless the context requires otherwise:

**"Dispute resolution proceeding"** means any structured process in which a neutral assists parties to a dispute in reaching a voluntary settlement by means of dispute resolution processes such as mediation, conciliation, facilitation, partnering, fact-finding, neutral evaluation, use of ombudsmen or any other proceeding leading to a voluntary settlement. For the purposes of this chapter, the term "dispute resolution proceeding" does not include arbitration.

**"Mediation"** means a process in which a neutral facilitates communication between the parties and without deciding the issues or imposing a solution on the parties enables them to understand and resolve their dispute.

**"Mediation program"** means a program of a public body through which mediators or mediation is made available and includes the director, agents and employees of the program.

**"Mediator"** means a neutral who is an impartial third party selected by agreement of the parties to a dispute to assist them in mediation.

**"Neutral"** means an individual who is trained or experienced in conducting dispute resolution proceedings and in providing dispute resolution services.

**"Public body"** means any legislative body; any authority, board, bureau, commission, district or agency of the Commonwealth or any political subdivision of the Commonwealth, including counties, cities and towns, city councils, boards of supervisors, school boards, planning commissions, boards of visitors of institutions of higher education; and other organizations, corporations or agencies in the Commonwealth supported wholly or principally by public funds. "Public body" includes any committee, subcommittee, or other entity however designated, of the public body or formed to advise the public body, including those with private sector or citizen members and corporations organized by the Virginia Retirement System. For the purposes of this chapter the term "public body" does not include courts of the Commonwealth.

**"State agency"** or "agency" means any authority, instrumentality, officer, board or other unit of state government empowered by the basic laws to adopt regulations or decide cases. For the purposes of this chapter, the term "state agency" does not include the courts of the Commonwealth.

(2002, c. 633.)

**§ 2.2-4116. Authority to use dispute resolution proceedings.**

A. Except as specifically prohibited by law, if the parties to the dispute agree, any public body may use dispute resolution proceedings to narrow or resolve any issue

in controversy. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit or limit other public body dispute resolution authority. Nothing in this chapter shall create or alter any right, action, cause of action, or be interpreted or applied in a manner inconsistent with the Administrative Process Act (§ [2.2-4000](#) et seq.), applicable federal or state law or any provision that requires the Commonwealth to obtain or maintain federal delegation or approval of any regulatory program. Nothing in this chapter shall prevent the use of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act to obtain the disclosure of information concerning expenses incurred in connection with a dispute resolution proceeding or the amount of money paid by a public body or agency to settle a dispute.

B. A decision by a public body to participate in or not to participate in a specific dispute resolution proceeding shall be within the discretion of the public body and is not subject to judicial review. This subsection does not affect or supersede any law mandating the use of a dispute resolution proceeding.

C. An agreement arising out of any dispute resolution proceeding shall not be binding upon a public body unless the agreement is affirmed by the public body. (2002, c. 633.)

**§ 2.2-4117. State agency promotion of dispute resolution proceedings.**

A. Each state agency shall adopt a written policy that addresses the use of dispute resolution proceedings within the agency and for the agency's program and operations. The policy shall include, among other things, training for employees involved in implementing the agency's policy and the qualifications of a neutral to be used by the agency.

B. The head of each state agency shall designate an existing or new employee to be the dispute resolution coordinator of the agency. The duties of a dispute resolution coordinator may be collateral to those of an existing official.

C. Each state agency shall review its policies, procedures and regulations and shall determine whether and how to amend such policies, procedures and regulations to authorize and encourage the use of dispute resolution proceedings.

D. Any state agency may use the services of other agencies' employees as neutrals and an agency may allow its employees to serve as neutrals for other agencies as part of a neutral-sharing program.

E. This chapter does not supersede the provisions of subdivision 2 of § [2.2-1001](#) and subdivision B 4 of § [2.2-3000](#), which require certain agencies to participate in the mediation program administered by the Department of Employment Dispute Resolution.

(2002, c. 633.)

**§ 2.2-4118. Interagency Dispute Resolution Advisory Council.**

A. The Interagency Dispute Resolution Advisory Council is hereby created as an advisory council to the Secretary of Administration.

B. The Council shall consist of two dispute resolution coordinators from each Secretariat appointed by each Secretary, the Director of the Department of Employment Dispute Resolution, and three persons who are not employees of the Commonwealth, at least two of whom have experience in mediation, appointed by the Governor. The appointees who are not employees of the Commonwealth may be selected from nominations submitted by the Virginia Mediation Network and the Virginia State Bar and the Virginia Bar Association Joint Committee on Alternative Dispute Resolution, who shall each nominate two persons for each such vacancy. In no case shall the Governor be bound to make any appointment from such nominations. The Secretary of Administration or his designee shall serve as chairman of the Council.

C. The Council shall have the power and duty to:

1. Conduct training seminars and educational programs for the members and staff of agencies and public bodies and other interested persons on the use of dispute resolution proceedings.
2. Publish educational materials as it deems appropriate on the use of dispute resolution proceedings.
3. Report on its activities as may be appropriate and on the use of dispute resolution proceedings, including recommendations for changes in the law to the Governor and General Assembly.

D. Every state agency shall cooperate with and provide such assistance to the Council as the Council may request.

(2002, c. 633.)

### **§ 2.2-4119. Confidentiality between parties; exemption to Freedom of Information Act.**

A. Except for the materials described in subsection B, all dispute resolution proceedings conducted pursuant to this chapter are subject to the Virginia Freedom of Information Act (§ [2.2-3700](#) et seq.).

B. All memoranda, work products, or other materials contained in the case file of a mediator are confidential and all materials in the case file of a mediation program pertaining to a specific mediation are confidential. Any communication made in or in connection with a mediation that relates to the dispute, including communications to schedule a mediation, whether made to a mediator, a mediation program, a party or any other person is confidential. A written settlement agreement is not confidential unless the parties agree in writing. Confidential materials and communications are not subject to disclosure or discovery in any judicial or administrative proceeding except (i) when all parties to the mediation agree, in writing, to waive the confidentiality; (ii) to the extent necessary in a subsequent action between the mediator and a party for damages arising out of the mediation; (iii) statements, memoranda, materials and other tangible evidence, otherwise subject to discovery, which were not prepared specifically for use in and



actually used in the mediation; (iv) where communications are sought or offered to prove or disprove a claim or complaint of professional misconduct or malpractice filed against the mediator; (v) where a threat to inflict bodily injury is made; (vi) where communications are intentionally used to plan, attempt to commit or commit a crime or conceal an ongoing crime; (vii) where communications are sought or offered to prove or disprove a claim or complaint of misconduct or malpractice filed against a party, nonparty, participant or representative of a party based on conduct occurring during a mediation; (viii) where communications are sought or offered to prove or disprove any of the reasons listed in § [8.01-576.12](#) that would enable a court to vacate a mediated agreement; or (ix) as provided by law or rule other than the Virginia Freedom of Information Act (§ [2.2-3700](#) et seq.). The use of attorney work product in a mediation shall not result in a waiver of the attorney work product privilege. Unless otherwise specified by the parties, no mediation proceeding shall be electronically or stenographically recorded.

(2002, c. 633.)

# The Virginia Administrative Dispute Resolution Act (VADRA)



Prepared by the VADRA Interagency Council  
Training and Education Subcommittee

**October 3, 2005**

## What is the VADRA?

- §§ 2.2-4115 through 4119, Code of Va., effective 7-1-02
- Encourages use of ADR by local governments and state executive branch agencies in a variety of administrative areas
- Creates the Interagency Dispute Resolution Advisory Council

## What is the VADRA? (cont.)

- Requires executive branch agencies to develop policies addressing the use of ADR
- Requires each agency head to appoint an employee to serve as the agency's Dispute Resolution Coordinator (DRC)

## Key Points to Remember

- Think broadly
- This will be a committed, steady, and evolving process.

## ADR: An Overview of Methods and Issues

### Ways of Dealing with Conflict

- Avoidance
- “Traditional” Negotiation
- Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)
- Litigation
- Violence

## What is ADR?

- ADR provides alternatives to, but does not take the place of, “Traditional Processes”
- ADR is voluntary
- ADR empowers and enables the parties to a dispute to seek solutions which *they* decide meet their needs
- Generally, ADR uses a neutral third party to help the parties communicate and resolve their dispute

## Interest-Based Conflict Resolution Principles

- Focus on the issues
- Separate the people from the problem
- Explore the interest underlying the issues
- Look at *needs* (interests), not just *wants* (positions)
- Be alert for new possibilities
- Be open, creative
- Seek ways to meet both parties’ needs
- Look for “win-win” solutions

## Case Study

- What are each party's *positions*?
- What are each party's underlying "*interests*?"
- Is there any common ground between any of their interests?
- If not resolved, what is the likely future of this situation?
- What might resolve (or improve) the situation now?

## A Spectrum of ADR Methods

- Preventative methods
- Facilitated methods
- Input and Advisory methods
- Decisional methods

## Reasons for Using ADR

- Faster
- Less costly
- Easier, less formality
- Less confrontational, adversarial
- Creative, practical solutions
- Avoiding precedent

## Reasons for Using ADR (cont.)

- Better for on-going relationships
- Participant satisfaction
- Solutions with “buy-in” likely to last
- Neutrals may be chosen
- Little to lose by attempting ADR
- Parties retain control and outcome

## Reasons *not* to use ADR

- Need for precedent or certainty
- Anticipation of bad faith
- When one party mainly seeks delay
- Public policy development – openness/record needed
- Options are dictated or limited by law

## Reasons *not* to use ADR (cont.)

- Serious power imbalances exist
- Linkage to other litigation
- Outcome will have significant effect on other people
- ADR as improper substitute for other required action



## Interest-Based Problem-Solving

- No third party
- Parties agree to use an interest-based model:
  - Set communication & decision “ground rules”
  - Jointly identify issues, criteria for success
  - Joint brainstorming, selection of options
  - Emphasize respect, cooperation, listening
  - Seek to meet *their* needs to meet *yours*
  - Focus on future, escape from past

## Partnering

- Pioneered by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- A government/contractor *team* meets to:
  - Identify potential future disputes
  - Tailor methods for each potential dispute
  - Develop relationships to avoid conflict
- Work is done in a facilitated “workshop” shortly after a contract is signed

## Ombuds

- State employee or contractor designated to:
  - Help customers with service
  - Offer employees an “ear”
  - Funnel complaints to right place
  - Resolve conflict early and informally
  - Advise management on systemic problems
  - Be part of a proactive process

## Conciliation

- Usually informal and unstructured
- Neutrality and confidentiality not guaranteed
- Conciliator may offer advice and perspectives
- Management may use as a personal skill
- May be associated with coaching and mentoring

## Conflict Coaching

- Manager with proven negotiation, communication and leadership skills helps others (e.g., supervisors, employees, teams) to:
  - Solve a workplace problem and/or
  - Overcome tensions that could grow worse

## Conflict Coaching (cont.)

- Unlike a mediator, a coach
  - May provide advice drawn from own experience & training in interest-based conflict resolution
  - Need not be impartial
- Coaching can be
  - Problem-specific or
  - Part of an ongoing mentoring relationship

## Mediation

- Very common ADR method
- Voluntary, structured, confidential
- Also known as “*facilitated negotiation*”
- Often future-oriented
- Mediator a trained, neutral expert
- Oriented to parties’ *self-determination*
- Mediator doesn’t “decide” anything

## Goals of Mediation

- Allow parties to express their feelings
- Help parties see each other’s perspectives
- Help clear up misunderstandings
- Help determine underlying interests
- Help parties recognize their overlapping interests and areas of agreement
- Help parties devise their own solutions, building on the interests they identified.

## Facilitation

- A *group* process
- Group usually has a *goal* in mind
- Facilitator “directs traffic,” clarifies, and records
- Facilitator usually does considerable advance preparation with parties

## Facilitation (cont.)

- Facilitators often use a “six-step” process:
  - Identify and clarify issues
  - Select an issue and discuss thoroughly
  - Develop criteria for evaluating options
  - Brainstorm ideas
  - Analyze, select, and refine ideas
  - Develop implementation plan

## Regulatory Negotiation \*

- Variation of notice and comment (APA) rulemaking
  - Agency forms a rule-making committee
  - Committee represents those affected by rule
  - Committee develops the *proposed* rule by consensus
  - A facilitator leads the committee
  - Agency retains total authority over *final* rule
- \* *Not specifically authorized by VADRA*

## ADR Panels

- May be labor/management, consumer, etc.
- Panel reviews parties' evidence and statements
- Panel may attempt conciliation
- Panel may decide or make recommendations
- Members usually trained in sensitive handling

## Early Neutral Evaluation

- The neutral 3<sup>rd</sup> party evaluates *merits* of an issue
- The neutral is an experienced subject-matter expert
- The parties negotiate after hearing the neutral's opinion

## Fact-finding

- The neutral 3<sup>rd</sup> party investigates and determines a disputed fact
- Often used for technical issues, discrete factual issues that are part of a larger dispute
- May be a “time-out” part of mediation
- Parties may negotiate to be bound (or not) by finding

## Mini-trial

- “Judges” are panel of disputant’s decision-makers
- Panel receives summary case presentations
- Panel asks questions, tests presentations
- Panel then negotiates and seeks consensus
- A way for parties to retain control and resolve:
  - Where trial would be long and complex
  - Where dispute involves technical matters

## Settlement Conferences

- Usually court-ordered
- Encourages litigants to narrow and resolve issues
- Judge or other neutral presides
- Usually, the Judge at the conference is not the Judge at trial
- Judge leads discussion of settlement options
- Judge may advise on law, precedent, and likely outcome



## Arbitration \*

- Adjudicatory: Arbitrator is “private judge”
- Often contract based
- Arbitrator often has subject-matter expertise
- Final decision has few appeal possibilities
- Decisions usually short, not precedential
- Controversial in some contexts
- Can include “non-binding” versions

\* *Not available under VADRA*

## Shared Experiences

## Group Discussion

Developing a policy and  
implementing a program

Data collection

Resource Materials

## Wrap-up and evaluation

### **Agency ADR Pilots in Virginia**

A growing number of Virginia's state agencies are developing new ADR approaches to problem-solving, saving them time and money while increasing stakeholder satisfaction.

**The first wave of agency ADR pilots (2004-2005):** Seven state agencies have shown remarkable initiative and results through ADR pilots spanning a broad range of governmental functions. Responses from pilot agency staff and their stakeholders have been positive, with ADR approaches viewed as “opening the door” to increased trust, better communications, and reduced costs in terms of dollars and staff time spent for traditional, more adversarial proceedings.

- Board of Accountancy: mediation used to resolve consumer complaints against certified public accountants
- VITA: facilitation used to resolve bid protests and other procurement-related and contractual disputes
- Dept. of General Services: interest-based negotiation process established for resolving contractual disputes between agencies and vendors
- Dept. of Forestry: mediation used to streamline the enforcement of the DOF water quality law, change the behavior of repeat violators, and provide for greater resource protection
- Dept. of Environmental Quality: facilitation used to improve public participation in agency decision-making on regulatory and permitting issues
- Dept. of Charitable Gaming: ADR practices incorporated within agency's educational and enforcement responsibilities
- Dept. of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services: facilitation used to improve staff communication, cohesiveness and coordination in direct care unit

**The second wave (2005 and beyond):** Virginia state agencies should consider joining the second wave of agency ADR pilots in one or more functional areas of their operations -- be it regulation, enforcement, procurement, contracting, licensing, permitting, policymaking, intergovernmental relations, or any other area of interest. By consulting with their internal ADR Coordinator and thinking creatively, an ADR pilot using consensus-building and effective conflict management processes could be developed and lead the way to less costly, more effective outcomes.

For more information, state agencies may email the Interagency ADR Advisory Council at [vadra@edr.virginia.gov](mailto:vadra@edr.virginia.gov) or visit its web site at <http://www.vadra.virginia.gov> . The Council is committed to linking all agencies with guidance and information in getting started, including, when requested and available, two-person consulting teams composed of a Council member and a volunteer private sector expert.

## **Guidelines for Agency Dispute Resolution Coordinators**

### **What is a Dispute Resolution Coordinator?**

Governors, legislatures and agencies have begun to establish Dispute Resolution (DR) programs in state government through executive orders and legislation and to encourage greater use of collaborative decision making processes. The responsibility for leading and staffing implementation efforts at the agency level is often placed in the hands of Dispute Resolution Coordinators or similarly titled people. Approaches to establishing DR coordinators, and issues that arise such as capacity and resources, depend upon whether a statewide effort is underway to integrate dispute resolution in state government, versus whether a single agency decides to employ dispute resolution more widely.

The DR Coordinator designation is a loose one. Coordinators may range from high-level political appointees to career civil servants. Also, a coordinator's role may vary depending upon the state or agency. The role may include collecting data, making and implementing plans and programs, providing training, coordination and/or technical assistance. It also could involve managing, tracking and evaluating program activities.

Whatever the duties, the trend toward establishing agency DR Coordinators reflects:

- A) the growing importance of DR in a state's or agency's decision making, and
- B) the importance of assigning responsibility (having a point person) for DR implementation within an agency.

States that have undertaken statewide efforts involving multiple agencies have found a need to provide resources and coordination-including consultation, technical assistance, and training to their network of DR Coordinators.

To date, three states have enacted executive orders to integrate DR in state government-Massachusetts, Oregon, and New Mexico. These executive orders call on agencies to appoint DR Coordinators and make assessments of their agencies' DR needs, and then develop and implement plans. Massachusetts and Oregon have statewide offices of dispute resolution that serve as resource centers, providing a centralized source of expertise. They provide guidance, training and technical assistance for state agencies on DR policies and practices. New Mexico has an ADR Council made up of representatives from various agencies, but no established resource center. This lack of a central resource center has presented some challenges in implementing the state's executive order.

## Orientation and Training for DR Coordinators

Whether a state is only beginning to appoint agency DR Coordinators or is dealing with turnover of coordinators, it is important to offer initial orientation and on-going training. At the minimum, the initial training should provide:

- A) a background on DR in state government;
- B) an overview of statutes and relevant policies;
- C) a discussion of coordinators' roles and responsibilities;
- D) an introduction to available resources (including people and information);
- E) and an opportunity to identify their needs for further training and assistance.

See Oregon's and Massachusetts' orientation agendas for a useful example.

States with DR Coordinators have found that training is most effective when done over a period of time in two to four hour sessions. Levels of experience are likely to vary within the group, and this must be taken into account when planning the training activities. Some states find it useful to involve new coordinators in planning the training to ensure that their needs are met.

## Overview of Agencies' Uses of DR Process

The term "**Dispute Resolution**" refers here to a collection of approaches that allow parties to engage in collaborative decision-making. Agencies should use the term carefully because it can be off-putting when parties do not think they are involved in a conflict or dispute. Other ways to describe these approaches include "joint problem solving", and "consensus building".

Dispute Resolution includes a range of processes from informal to formal; from unassisted negotiation to facilitated collaborative decision-making; from mediation to simple fact finding; early neutral evaluation, and/or arbitration. They include parties acting alone to resolve conflict through informal negotiation, or parties who seek assistance from a facilitator or mediator to help them resolve conflicts or issues. Parties may also ask a fact finder or arbitrator to resolve the dispute for them.

DR processes can be used both proactively and reactively. A **proactive approach** begins when an issue is known to be contentious, and early involvement of key parties can help manage any inevitable conflicts and build consensus on solutions. **Reactive approaches** are responses to contentious issues that have developed into full-blown disputes.

Agencies use a variety of collaborative problem solving and dispute resolution processes. DR Coordinators are responsible for promoting the appropriate steps and processes an agency should follow, and should become highly familiar with the range of DR approaches that are available. There are numerous books and articles describing these processes and their use in government settings.

Dozens of state and federal agencies have established dispute resolution programs. For a listing of state agency DR programs, see PCI's on-line Directory of State Dispute Resolution Programs.

For federal listings, see the Office of Personnel Management's Alternative Dispute Resolution: A Resource Guide.

Agencies use dispute resolution processes both **internally** (to resolve workplace disputes or to address intra-agency issues collaboratively) and **externally** (to work out agreements and mediate disputes over policy formulation, implementation and enforcement). Process assistance such as mediation, has also proven extremely valuable for intergovernmental issues, as well as with inter-agency policy issues.

While mediation typically occurs in the context of specific disputes involving a limited number of parties, facilitated processes are used to develop and implement broad policies and typically involve numerous participants who represent a number of interests. The latter are often termed consensus processes, policy dialogues, or negotiated rulemakings. "Process assistance" has been useful in numerous settings where full consensus may not be practicable. These include facilitated processes to promote information exchange or collaboration in connection with inter and intra-agency work groups, or for the purposes of involving the public.

PCI's Practical Guide to Consensus offers advice on assessing the potential for, and the use of, consensus processes. Also useful is the Oregon Dispute Resolution Commissions' Collaborative Approaches: A Handbook for Public Policy Decision Making and Conflict Resolution.

Consensus processes have been employed since the mid 1970s to develop scores of potentially controversial federal and state rules, policies, and legislative proposals addressing environmental problems, regulating health and safety concerns, and allocating scarce budgetary or other public resources. An example of one such state process is featured in a PCI produced video titled Building Consensus: Transportation Rulemaking in Oregon (2000). Also useful are: Jim Arthur's A Guide to Negotiated Rulemaking and Pilot Rulemaking; Matt McKinney's Negotiated Rulemaking: Involving Citizens in Public Decisions; and the Texas Negotiated Rulemaking Deskbook.

Agencies have found DR assistance to be especially helpful in government contracting both before hand, in setting up provisions to use DR in contract clauses, and later in resolving contracting disputes. An agency may seek the assistance of a **neutral** in determining what the substantive outcome should be through a process like early neutral evaluation, fact-finding, mini-trial or settlement conference. The neutral assists the parties in a structured exchange of information. After the presentation of information, the neutral may advise the parties on the strengths and weaknesses of their respective positions. The neutral helps the parties understand how a situation is likely to play out; the downside risks as well as the upside possibilities from the perspective of a disinterested, knowledgeable third party. Such a neutral can help the parties gain an understanding that will let them negotiate more realistically and effectively even when they do not have assistance.

There are also processes (e.g., ombuds, partnering) that focus on improving information flow, or on building cohesive relationships, or constructive relations between parties, so problems can be detected early and dealt with to prevent escalation. Recently, a number of state agencies that oversee large construction projects have employed partnering procedures. **Partnering** is a process in which parties to large, ongoing contract establish at the outset a collaborative approach to avoiding and addressing conflicts in order to reduce the number of claims and



adversarial proceedings. Some useful examples include: a federal report titled Partnering for Success: A Blueprint for Promoting Government-Industry Communication and Teamwork; CPR's Procedures and Clauses links; and the U.S. Air Force's ADR site on contracting. The 1996 Report of the Dispute Avoidance and Resolution Task Force of the American Arbitration Association is another useful tool.

## Key Elements in Integrating DR in an Agency

**“Integrating dispute resolution”** refers to creating a conflict resolution system within a governmental context that works efficiently. That is, a system that allows the agency to take full advantage of DR or other collaborative processes where most appropriate. There is no one way to do this, and no foolproof system. The hallmark of instituting an agency DR program should be flexibility to develop a program that serves the context, the issues and the parties.

In getting started, DR Coordinators should bear in mind the following key elements to launching a successful program:

- **Collaborate.** Take a collaborative approach to designing and implementing a new DR program. State agencies have learned that a DR program based on input from internal and external stakeholders will face less resistance and have greater probability of success than one that is imposed on them.
- **Get help.** Implementing DR is not a one-person job and it requires involvement of people from many different parts of an agency. It often requires initiating some “culture change” within a bureaucracy. One useful way to share the work and give others an investment in program success is to include them on a working or advisory group. Often there are other DR resources in state government such as centralized state DR offices that can provide consultation and technical assistance. See the PCI Directory of State DR Programs to identify resource centers in your state.
- **Get high-level support.** New governmental programs tend to thrive only when they receive support from top-level leaders. DR Coordinators should seek a statement from the agency head or other high-level leader championing the use of DR and asking agency personnel to cooperate with the DR Coordinator. They should also seek leaders' visible involvement, such as coming to the training sessions to explain the importance of DR, especially when it is mandatory. These and other conspicuous efforts by top agency officials can be very effective in promoting the program.
- **Analyze where DR can be most helpful.** Getting a program off the ground will be easier if it is designed to help agency personnel deal with the tough issues, problems, and disputes they face. Begin by exploring systematically which of these issues or disputes will be most amenable to DR methods. This analysis or assessment may be undertaken as part of developing an overall agency plan, but may also be done in the context of assessing a particular program or conflict for its DR collaborative potential.
- **Use pilot programs.** Pilots offer a manageable way to address basic issues, find and deal with “bugs”, and provide success stories.

There are a few keys to successfully introducing DR in a state agency, no matter what kinds of issues or disputes the program will be designed to address. They are:

**Use a Collaborative Approach.** Collaborative program design will increase buy-in and program quality. Collaboration involves identifying internal and external stakeholders at the earliest possible opportunity and involving them as much as possible in conceptualizing a new program. Agency leaders, staff and users need opportunities to provide input and feedback, and to have a sense that their input makes a difference.

Building support within an agency involves engaging others. It is not only important to find leaders at the highest level of the agency, but also to identify champions among highly respected peers and co-workers. Leadership with government agencies is not only vertical but horizontal.

Collaboration includes working with stakeholders to determine how to:

1. use DR to meet agency needs;
2. educate the relevant actors about these methods and how they may be employed;
3. determine how to meet resource needs;
4. identify barriers to effective conflict resolution, and
5. identify incentives to overcome the barriers.

## Forms of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)

Dispute Resolution Method	Definition
Mediation	A process in which a trained neutral third party helps disputants negotiate a mutually agreeable settlement. The mediator has no authority and does not render a decision but may suggest some substantive options to encourage the parties to expand the range of possible resolutions under consideration. Any decision must be reached by the parties themselves.
Facilitation	A collaborative process in which a neutral seeks to assist a group of individuals or other parties to discuss constructively a number of complex, potentially controversial issues.
Regulatory Negotiation	Rather than promulgate a rule by the normal "notice and comment" procedure, an administrative agency attempts to negotiate the text of a rule or regulation with the stakeholders who will be impacted by the rule or regulation. It is also called <i>Negotiated Rulemaking</i> . If the agency and the stakeholders agree on the terms of the rule, the agency then promulgates the rule through its normal notice and comment procedure. This process is usually managed by a mediator.
Fact Finding	A third party neutral (having any relevant technical or scientific expertise) is employed to determine the key disputed facts. Depending on the parties' preference, the factual findings may or may not be binding in the event of subsequent litigation. While the neutral determines the facts, s/he does not apply the law to the facts or otherwise decide how the dispute should be resolved. Rather, after the neutral submits the factual findings, the parties attempt to negotiate a settlement. The negotiation may or may not be facilitated by a mediator.
Conciliation	The process of resolving a dispute through the use of various ADR techniques and systems that are self-applied and do not necessarily rely on a third party neutral.
Early Neutral Evaluation	A third party meets with the parties at the outset of litigation to clarify the parties' positions and identify key factual issues in dispute. The neutral then assists the parties in identifying what additional information they need to make an informed settlement decision, designs a limited discovery plan to gather the information in a cost-effective way and, after the limited discovery is complete, mediates settlement negotiations. Early Neutral Evaluation can be employed where no court proceeding is pending if the parties are willing to voluntarily exchange relevant information.
Policy Dialogues	A process by which an administrative agency consults informally with representatives of all stakeholder groups in an interactive manner where views are exchanged, analyzed and criticized. The objective is to identify points of disagreement, explore perceived risks and search for shared interests. It may or may not occur in connection with a rulemaking proceeding. If it occurs in connection with rulemaking, the dialogue continues periodically until the rule is promulgated.
Peer Review	A panel of employees (or employees and managers) who review evidence and listen to the parties' arguments to decide an issue in dispute. Peer review panel members are trained in the handling of sensitive issues. The panel's decision may or may not be binding on the parties.
Management Review Board	Similar to peer review, a panel of managers who review evidence and listen to the parties' arguments to decide an issue in dispute. Board members are trained in the handling of sensitive issues. The decision of the board may or may not be binding on the parties. Also called dispute resolution boards.
Arbitration	A process in which a neutral third party is empowered to decide disputed issues after hearing evidence and arguments from the parties. The arbitrator's decision may be binding on the parties either through agreement or operation of law. Arbitration may be voluntary (i.e., where the parties agree to use it) or may be mandatory and the exclusive means available for handling certain disputes.

## PRINCIPLES OF ADR SYSTEMS DESIGN

1. What a system should *not* do:
  - It should not be a substitute for good management, good communication, and respect for others.
  - It should not displace systemic responses to systemic problems.
  - It should not be used as “band-aid” or to make problems “go away.” ADR needs to be an integral part of an overall sound system of management.
  - It should not focus only on “cases.” The broader scope of ADR systems should include **preventative** strategies, such as training in conflict management for supervisors and managers and organizational development with conflict management as a component.
2. Systems design, review and adjustment should always start with some information on basics, including the following:
  - What is the perceived problem, which prompts interest in ADR and change?
  - What are the main kinds of conflict or disputes arising in the organization? What do the numbers show – history, today, projections of cases? How do cases typically arise?
  - What is the organization’s culture and mission, and how do those factors relate to how conflict/disputes arise and are resolved (or not)?
  - How are disputes handled now? What works well, what does not?
  - What are the results of the current process – time, costs, satisfaction, long-term?
  - Who/what parts of the organization are key stakeholders in approving and making any change a success?
3. In reviewing, designing, re-designing and evaluating the ADR system, stakeholders should be fully involved. In particular, to avoid “turf” problems and confusion for users/employees, it is important to clarify relations with existing dispute-resolution entities (Ombuds, personnel/human resources offices, in-house lawyers, etc.)
4. The ADR system should be *accessible*. People should know that the system exists, have a good idea of what it can do for them, and know where to go to use it or find out more.
5. Users (employees, managers, customers) must perceive the system as *trustworthy*.
6. The system should be *simple to use and understand*.
7. The system should be *adapted to the organization’s culture*.
8. The system should intercept potential problems as *early as possible*.

9. The system should resolve disputes at the *lowest organizational level possible*.
10. The system should involve the *least process, procedures, and bureaucracy possible*.
11. The system should be *flexible* and able to use any ADR method appropriate, so ADR can be *tailored* to the needs of a given situation.
12. The system should have an “*intake*” point, which is well trained and empowered to determine whether, and what kind, of ADR is appropriate in a given situation.
13. The system should include several kinds of *training*, which needs to be on going:
  - “Marketing” and awareness training, to foster recognition of the value of ADR, how to use it, and where to get it.
  - Training for everyone (and supervisors/managers in particular) in conflict management, communication skills, how to deal with “difficult people,” preventative use of interest-based approaches, and personal interest-based negotiation skills.
  - “User” training for those who participate in ADR as negotiators or management representatives.
  - Skills training of neutrals, intake personnel, EEO counselors and others with a more direct role in managing or providing ADR services.
14. Myths about training:
  - Everyone should be trained as mediators.
  - If you teach people about ADR, they will use it.
15. Barriers and resistance to ADR can come from many sources. Common ones are:
  - General inertia and resistance to change.
  - The profound *differentness* of ADR.
  - Fears – loss of control, weakness, loss of present power, the unknown, conflict with images, negative implications of rhetoric (e.g., “compromise” and “collaboration”), overcoming a culture of suspicion.
  - Over-generalizing ADR’s inapplicability.
  - Needing to justify one’s own resolution vs. having a court order a result.
16. Overcoming barriers and resistance:
  - Importance of leadership
  - Understanding the present organization and its culture, and the interests of all those who are part of how disputes are produced and handled now. Try to make your ADR system fit the culture, rather than making the culture fit your system.

- Consult/make friends with all stakeholders, find ways to display benefits to them, help them perceive their ownership and the credit they will receive.
- Let the stakeholders play a major role in defining what “success” of an ADR system is, and consult them during evaluation (discussed below).
- Deal creatively with resource needs – a shortage of resources is a *beginning* point, not an *ending* point.
- Display success of others in similar situations.
- Incentives, rewards for stakeholders:
  - Recognition, publicity, being part of a new initiative
  - Increased efficiency, effectiveness, productivity
  - Relationship to other management reforms and organizational initiatives...team-building, restructuring, government initiatives, etc.
  - Improvement of workplace/customer relationships
  - Cost-savings
  - Personal financial/career enhancement
- Pilot projects: “starting small:”
  - Develop a pilot with success in mind
  - Look for allied stakeholders, build in their definition of success
  - Develop an evaluation protocol (keep in mind displaying success)
  - Link pilot to larger organization goals
  - Display results widely, including how it can be adapted elsewhere

17. Evaluation:

- Establish clear goals for success. Make them realistic and *obtainable*.
- Establish measures of success linked to goals. Use objective, outcome-oriented goals in preference to subjective goals where possible.
- Link criteria to organization’s mission, strategic plan, and ADR-related goals.
- Consult with stakeholders for their view of what the criteria should be.
- In addition, consider who else will review your results (and what they will look for).
- Have on-going goals and measures for established programs as well as pilots.
- Establish responsibility for measuring and reporting. Involve stakeholders, skeptics.
- Make your evaluation protocol an on-going process lined to continuous improvement and growth of your ADR program.

Additional Resource: Federal ADR Network at [Deborah.Laufer@erols.com](mailto:Deborah.Laufer@erols.com)

## **Agency ADR Assessment & Planning Tool**

(This Assessment Tool is for internal agency use as an aid in developing an ADR Plan for your agency.  
Reference: 2001 Massachusetts Office of Dispute Resolution)

### **I. ASSESSMENT**

- A. What is the agency's mission? Is there a shared understanding of what the agency does, both within and outside the agency?**
- B. Does the agency have any policies, procedures, laws or regulations regarding the use of ADR?**
- C. List the various types of conflicts the agency experiences. Roughly estimate the number of each type of conflict the agency might experience in one year.**
- D. Using whatever general measure you choose, how much time is spent on each type of conflict? What types of conflicts are the most disruptive to the agency? Which types of conflicts are recurring?**
- E. In each type of conflict, does your agency play the role of: a) disputant, b) interested third-part, c) enforcer of laws or regulations, d) other?**
- F. For the most disruptive and/or recurring conflicts, who are the disputing parties? How organized are they? Are there other parties that frequently have a stake in the outcome of these conflicts?**
- G. For the most disruptive and/or recurring conflicts, what conflict resolution methods does your agency typically use? Who makes decisions about which conflict resolution forum to use? Why does your agency use these methods?**
- H. Do these conflicts get resolved? Do the resolutions last? Are the disputants generally satisfied with the resolutions?**
- I. For the most disruptive and/or recurring conflicts, what are the costs involved? staff time? expenses? What effect do they have on on-going relationships? on the organization's missions?**
- J. What is the earliest point and/or lowest level at which the agency regularly handles conflicts? Are there practices or systems in place to identify potential conflicts early?**
- K. Are agency meetings, both public and internal, effectively planned and facilitated?**

- L. Has the agency provided or sponsored training for its staff in meeting facilitation, negotiation, mediation, or some other aspect of ADR?**

- II. PLANNING**

- A. Having assessed the way conflict is handled in your agency, what is working well? What could be working better? What is missing?**
- B. What are the most important goal(s) for using ADR in your agency?**
- C. Where might ADR processes be used most effectively in your agency?**
- D. What obstacles or barriers to implementing ADR can you anticipate?**
- E. What resources, both within and outside your agency, are available for your use? How will you use these resources in: a) the ADR assessment, b) the creation of an agency ADR plan, c) designing an ADR system for your agency, d) providing intervention, mediation, facilitation, regulatory negotiation or some other ADR services.**
- F. How can your agency build its in-house capacity and improve its understanding of ADR?**
- G. Is there an interest or need for ADR training?**
- H. What systems or practices will the agency use to identify and review conflicts/disputes for ADR potential?  
Describe how such identification and review system would work.**
- I. What benchmarks will you use to measure the success of your plan?**



## **Overview – Training Managers About ADR**

***Managers generally are not interested in ADR as such – they ARE interested in:***

- Productivity (getting the job done!)
- Personal growth, developing personal skills
- Dealing with “problem” employees
- Maintaining a happy (or at least peaceful) workplace
- Not being the subject of complaints
- Direct and indirect costs of litigation (sometimes)

***Managers are adult learners, often sophisticated and jaded about training therefore:***

- Use first class training products (e.g., PowerPoint)
- Keep it short, make it “hands-on” and practical
- Use objective data to buttress points
- Start with a “bang” to get their attention
- Case studies may fit their model of analysis better than role-plays
- Start and end on time, tell them how to get more info
- If using their site, plan ahead – e.g., know their space and AV equipment

***Find out about their specific culture and try to use it in your training:***

- Doctors? Lawyers? Accountants?
- What are their specific incentives/disincentives to resolving complaints?
- Consult ahead to find examples of relevant conflict scenarios

***Buttress training with leadership and organizational allies of ADR***

- Get kick-off and other support from top and key personnel
- Link to internal ADR program personnel, legal, other influential “players”
- Find relevant “success stories” to display

## **PRACTICAL TIPS FOR MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES**

*-How to Participate Effectively in ADR-*

### **Prepare, as for any negotiation:**

- Understand your organization's expectations of you in this role
- Find out the nature of the case, and any information available
- Consider management's interests, not just potential *positions*
- Preliminarily consider the array of possible outcomes – *but stay flexible*
- Forecast other authorities who may need to be consulted, and how
- If possible, have some concessions in reserve – “concessions breed concessions”
- Manage expectations of people on your side of the table
- Understand and manage or accommodate the perspectives of your lawyer

### ***Establish trust with the “other side:”***

- Use an open, respectful demeanor
- Establish that you are not seeking an agreement at all costs – you present in good faith to listen and to see if the dispute can be resolved in a way that works for everyone
- Say what you mean and mean what you say
- Find something to validate about the other side's circumstances
- Make promises and *keep* them

### ***Make it easy for the “Other Side” to see things your way:***

- Listen more than you talk – and *listen actively*
- Be firm and rank, but respectful
- Remember: this may be your rare chance to access the other side directly
- Emphasize human terms, de-emphasize legal terms
- Allow them to express their emotions, be empathetic without “buying in”
- Leave them room to retreat (save face)
- Take a little heat!
- Be prepared to deal with ideas and options not considered before

### ***Let the mediator do the work of mediation***

- Be prepared to use confidential “caucus” to discuss options

## **CONSIDERATIONS FOR CASE SELECTION**

### **Factors that influence in favor of ADR include:**

1. There is now or is likely to be a continuing relationship between parties.
2. There may be benefits to either party hearing directly from the opposing side.
3. Either party likely would be influenced by the opinion of a neutral third party.
4. The parties have indicated a desire to settle.
5. Either party needs a swift resolution of the dispute.
6. Substantive issues are complicated by problems of communication, anger, perceptions of disrespect, etc.
7. The parties want to avoid substantial legal costs.
8. Irrespective of the merits of the case, agency management wants prompt resolution – for example, to avoid interfering with workplace productivity, to avoid retaliation claims or spreading disgruntlement while a case sits, to avoid external effects and bad publicity, to enhance customer satisfaction, etc.

### **Factors favoring ADR relating to the nature of the case or dispute include:**

1. The facts of the dispute are complex or of a complicated technical nature not well suited to litigation.
2. The parties desire to maintain flexibility in the relief they seek.
3. Trial preparation will be difficult, costly, and/or time-consuming, and these costs would outweigh any benefit that the Agency is likely to receive if the matter proceeds to court.
4. There is no need for a legal precedent in the matter.
5. There is a need to avoid an adverse legal precedent in this matter.
6. The defendant, if found liable, would face a great deal of legal exposure.
7. There is a reasonable probability of an unfavorable determination in factual issues.

8. ADR could significantly narrow the issues in controversy even if it is unlikely to lead to a complete resolution of the matter.

## **Negative Factors against using ADR**

Here are some factors that may weigh against use of ADR. Not surprisingly, they are to a large degree the mirror image of the preceding pro-ADR lists.

1. There is a need for precedent on the issue in dispute.
2. A need exists for a public proceeding to resolve the issue or case.
3. There is need for a public sanction.
4. The matter is likely to settle soon without assistance.
5. The matter is very likely to be resolved promptly by motion in the agency's favor. However, avoid the appearance of using ADR only for your "weak" cases.
6. Either the opposing party or counsel representing the opposing party is not trustworthy.
7. A settlement would likely establish a precedent that would trigger additional claims and/or litigation.
8. An individual is sued in his or her person capacity as a Government (sic) employee.
9. There is reason to believe that the opposing party is engaging in fraudulent or criminal activity or will not act in good faith.
10. One or more of the parties is unable to negotiate effectively, with or without the assistance of counsel.
11. Injunctive relief is sought and no compromise or other relief is available or acceptable.

## **Additional Matters to Consider**

Neutral factors that should be considered in making this determination are:

1. Does the dispute indicate that the parties have an agenda separate and apart from the specific issues of the case? For example, are there underlying issues of a primarily emotional content (for which mediation is ideal), or a lack of clarity about complex facts for which fact-finding may be better?
2. What is the history of the dispute?
3. What is the anticipated outcome of the dispute, and is either party likely to appeal?
4. Have all the facts necessary to settle the case been discovered? Keep in mind, however, that often it is better to use ADR as early as possible, before positions have hardened and costs increase, even without complete information.
5. Do the persons who would be involved in ADR have authority, or immediate access to authority, to settle the case?
6. Who is in charge of handling the dispute for each of the parties?
7. Are there significant factual or legal disputes or do the parties generally agree upon the most relevant facts or applicable legal precedent?
8. Is the opposing party an individual, a corporation, or another governmental entity? How does that affect the ability of the opposing party to participate in the ADR process?
9. Are there non-party individuals or entities with interests in the outcome of the dispute?
10. If applicable, what is the position of the case on the court's docket?
11. What are the likely expenses of litigation as opposed to the likely expenses of ADR?
12. Does the dispute involve policy implications?
13. What is the anticipated time frame for resolving the dispute by means of litigation and by means of ADR?

## REFERENCE LISTING

### [www.policyconsensus.org](http://www.policyconsensus.org)

The Policy Consensus Initiative is a national non-profit program working with state leaders to establish and strengthen the use of collaborative practices in states to bring about more efficient governance.

### [www.vamediation.org](http://www.vamediation.org)

A Virginia non-profit member based organization promoting the professional growth of mediators, the exchange of ideas, and increased public awareness.

### [www.courts.state.va.us](http://www.courts.state.va.us)

The Department of Dispute Resolution Services of the Supreme Court of Virginia offers information regarding mediation certification, listing of currently certified mediators, and upcoming training opportunities.

### [www.abanet.org/dispute](http://www.abanet.org/dispute)

This is the newsletter of the American Bar Association Section of Dispute Resolution.

### [www.acresolution.org](http://www.acresolution.org)

This is the quarterly magazine of the Association for Conflict Resolution (ACR). It is a merger of the former Academy of Family Mediators (AFM), the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR) and the Conflict Resolution Education Network (CREnet).

### [www.edr.state.va.us](http://www.edr.state.va.us)

The Virginia Department of Employment Dispute Resolution is a state agency that oversees the employee grievance procedure and provides training on conflict management issues. In addition, it coordinates the employment mediation program to help resolve employment disputes within state agencies.

**STATEMENT OF POLICY  
GUIDELINE/TEMPLATE  
(Issued 11/21/03)**

---

**Implementing the Virginia Administrative Dispute Resolution Act (VADRA)**

The Virginia Administrative Dispute Resolution Act ("VADRA" or "the Act") (Va. Code §§ 2.2-4115 through -4119) recognizes that a fundamental function of government is collaborative problem solving, including the fair and efficient management of conflict and resolution of disputes. Litigation and other adversarial means of dispute resolution, while necessary at times, are costly in terms of dollars, human resources, and good will. The use of alternative, non-adversarial processes to address stakeholder concerns can avoid these costs in many instances. Establishing effective alternative processes requires that agencies first carefully assess their missions, strategic plans, policies, operations, fiscal resources and any laws governing the use of a particular collaborative or dispute resolution process.

**[Insert Agency Name]** ("Agency") is committed to utilizing stakeholder collaboration and alternative dispute resolution processes, as appropriate and as set forth in the Act, as means by which the Agency and affected parties may attempt to achieve mutually-agreed upon settlements of matters in controversy without incurring the costs associated with adversarial proceedings.

To that end, and with VADRA's Interagency Council (VADRA Council) as a resource for consultation and guidance, the Agency Director will:

- (i) Designate, if not already designated, an agency Dispute Resolution Coordinator (DRC), and authorize that individual to attend training for DRCs provided by the VADRA Council;

Name and title of Agency's DRC:

---

- (ii) Review its policies, procedures and regulations to determine whether to amend any of the foregoing to authorize and encourage the use of collaborative practices and dispute resolution proceedings, and, if so, how;

- (iii) Adopt written procedures, if appropriate, that specifically address the use of dispute resolution proceedings within the agency and for the agency's programs and operations; and
- (iv) Provide training for agency personnel involved in implementing any such written procedures.

The Agency will also cooperate with and provide assistance to the VADRA Council as the Council may request, including providing periodic reports on the Agency's activities and any associated outcomes resulting from its efforts to promote and use collaborative practices, conflict management techniques, and alternative dispute resolution processes.

The VADRA Council will serve as a resource to the Agency by (i) conducting training and briefing sessions, (ii) providing information and technical assistance in the development and use of such practices in state government, (iii) promoting networking among agency DRCs statewide, and (iv) coordinating and collaborating with similar initiatives in other states.

**Agency:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Agency Head Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Agency Head Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_



# **ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION Policy and Procedures Manual**

sample template

Commonwealth of Virginia

Department of \_\_\_\_\_

## **MISSION**

The mission or policy statement should highlight the agency's commitment to using ADR and the importance of the ADR program.

## **LAWS AND REGULATIONS**

A statement of the pertinent ADR laws and other relevant laws and regulations that govern the agency's operations should be included.

## **DEFINITIONS**

The agency should provide definitions of terms used in its policy and procedures, which are unique to its ADR program.

### **Sample of Definitions**

**“Department”** means the Department of [agency name]

**“VADRA”** means Virginia Administrative Dispute Resolution Act

**“Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Proceeding(s)”** means any structured process in which a neutral assists parties to a dispute in reaching a voluntary settlement by means of alternative dispute resolution processes such as mediation, conciliation, facilitation, or any other proceeding leading to a voluntary settlement.

**“Mediation”** means a process whereby a neutral third person facilitates communication between two or more parties to a dispute without deciding the issues or imposing a solution on the parties. The process is voluntary, informal and non-adversarial with the objective of helping the disputing parties reach a mutually acceptable and voluntary agreement. In mediation, decision-making authority rests with the disputants.

**“Neutral”** means an individual, such as a mediator, who is trained or experienced in conducting alternative dispute resolution proceedings.

## **PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

A clear and concise statement of program goals and objectives should be included.

### **Sample**

It is the objective of the Department of expedite the resolution of complaints and to reduce the associated costs of processing disputes/complaints by offering consumers and regulants the opportunity to resolve all qualified complaints through alternative dispute resolution proceedings as authorized under the Virginia Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 2002, Va. Code §§ 2.2-4115 through - 4119 (“VADRA”).

## **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND PROCEDURES**

Specify the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in the program's administration and utilization. The agency should outline step-by-step procedures for administering, using, tracking and evaluating the program.

### **SELECTION OF NEUTRALS**

State the criteria for selecting the evaluating neutrals/mediators and address ethical principles applicable to neutrals/mediators.

### **TRAINING AND MARKETING**

Include training plans and expectations relevant to all agency staff and to staff specifically involved with the ADR program.

## ***Usage Survey: Virginia Administrative Dispute Resolution Act (VADRA)***

**Governor's ADR Initiative:** The Governor's Management Objectives for 2004-2005 include Administrative Dispute Resolution as a top initiative, with the goal of increasing the use of ADR processes by 25-30% statewide by December 2005, as measured by the VADRA Council's annual survey.

**Survey Purpose:** Your responses to our initial survey in late 2003 provided very useful information on the general range of ADR experience among state agencies. This data has been used to identify agencies with ADR expertise so that they may serve as informational resources for others. As this initiative progresses, we are asking for slightly more detailed information in this year's survey, while keeping it user-friendly. The enhanced data will be used to establish a more specific baseline and measure the state's cumulative progress toward the Governor's ADR goals.

- **Total ADR Usage Statewide**

The information you submit this year will be used to identify total agency usage statewide of specific ADR processes. Identify the number of times your agency has used each of the ADR processes listed in FY03 and FY04, along with an assessment of the results produced. All agencies should have data for FY04. If you have data for FY03, please report it, otherwise list your response as "N/A" for FY03.

Please note that in Fall 2005, we will request this ADR usage information again for FY05 for comparison purposes. The data will be graphed for each fiscal year to measure trends in agency ADR usage and to determine our progress in achieving the Governor's goal of a 25-30% statewide increase by December 2005.

- **Resource Inventory**

This survey also requests information on agency employees who are ADR practitioners, specifically, trained mediators or facilitators. This information will be used by the VADRA Council in developing a shared pool of state employee ADR providers for agencies' use.

**Deadline:** Email completed surveys by **December 15, 2004** to [vadra@edr.virginia.gov](mailto:vadra@edr.virginia.gov)  
Your participation in the survey is extremely important in order to accurately track agency usage across the Commonwealth and to establish a shared pool of ADR providers. Every executive branch agency is required to participate in this survey.

1. **Agency Name & Code:**

2. **Designated VADRA Dispute Resolution Coordinator:**

**Name:**

**Job Title:**

**Phone:**

**Email:**

3. Please indicate the number of times your agency used the following ADR processes for each fiscal year. If your agency used an ADR process, also answer the bulleted questions on overall satisfaction and effectiveness, i.e., was it “better, faster, cheaper” than using more traditional and/or adversarial approaches? Explain your responses by providing supporting information (quantitative, qualitative, and/or anecdotal, etc.) on the value of the ADR process to your agency.

**Note:** The term “neutral” as used in this survey means an impartial third party trained or experienced in conducting dispute resolution proceedings and/or managing a collaborative decision-making process.

- A. **Partnering**: *(through a facilitated “workshop” led by a trained neutral shortly after a contract is signed, agency and contractor representatives agree on common objectives and cooperative approach and procedures to use in addressing potential trouble spots in implementing the contract)*

**FY03:** \_\_\_\_\_ **FY04:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall, if your agency used partnering, were the:**

- Contracting parties satisfied with the results?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Disputes resolved quicker than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Costs cheaper than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure

Please explain the value of this ADR process:

---

---

- B. **Facilitation**: *(stakeholders discuss complex, often controversial issues in collaborative, fair and constructive manner, with assistance of a trained neutral)*

**FY03:** \_\_\_\_\_ **FY04:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall, if your agency used facilitation, were the:**

- Participants satisfied with the results?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure

- Issues resolved quicker than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Costs cheaper than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure

Please explain the value of this ADR process:

---

---

**C. Ombuds:** *(trained “trouble-shooter” serves the agency’s customers proactively through discussing complaints or concerns with them and often funneling the issue to the right contact within the agency and assisting in its resolution)*

**FY03:** \_\_\_\_\_ **FY04:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall, if your agency used ombuds, were the:**

- Participants satisfied with the results?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Issues resolved quicker than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Costs cheaper than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure

Please explain the value of this ADR process:

---

---

**D. Mediation:** *(parties in conflict discuss and resolve differences in confidential setting, with assistance of trained neutral)*

**FY03:** \_\_\_\_\_ **FY04:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall, if your agency used mediation, were the:**

- Participants satisfied with the results?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Issues resolved quicker than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Costs cheaper than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure

Please explain the value of this ADR process:

---

---

**E. Policy Dialogue:** *(agency consults informally with representatives of all stakeholder groups in an interactive manner to exchange and analyze views, identify points of disagreement, explore perceived risks and search for shared interests)*

**FY03:** \_\_\_\_\_

**FY04:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall, if your agency used policy dialogue, were the:**

- Participants satisfied with the results?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Issues resolved quicker than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Costs cheaper than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure

Please explain the value of this ADR process:

---

---

**F. Interest-Based Negotiation:** *(parties solve an issue or dispute using a collaborative, interest-based approach, with or without the assistance of a neutral)*

**FY03:** \_\_\_\_\_

**FY04:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall, if your agency used interest-based negotiation, were the:**

- Participants satisfied with the results?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Issues resolved quicker than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Costs cheaper than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure

Please explain the value of this ADR process:

**G. Early Neutral Evaluation:** *(neutral expert meets with the parties at the outset of litigation to clarify positions, identify key factual issues in dispute, provide an assessment of the merits of the case and, when requested by the parties, facilitate settlement discussions)*

**FY03:** \_\_\_\_\_

**FY04:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall, if your agency used early neutral evaluation, were the:**

- Participants satisfied with the results?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Issues resolved quicker than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Costs cheaper than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure

Please explain the value of this ADR process:

---

---

**H. Joint Problem-Solving:** *(informal, unstructured communications between stakeholders sharing advice, perspectives; may involve coaching, mentoring, management skills)*

**FY03:** \_\_\_\_\_

**FY04:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall, if your agency used joint problem-solving, were the:**

- Participants satisfied with the results?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Issues resolved quicker than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure
- Costs cheaper than using a traditional and/or adversarial approach?  
\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Not sure

Please explain the value of this ADR process:

---

---

**I. Other:** *(Please list and briefly describe any other ADR processes your agency may have used, the number of times used for FY03 & FY04, and your comments on overall value, satisfaction and effectiveness, i.e., whether the ADR process was “better, faster, cheaper” than traditional and/or adversarial processes.)*



i. \_\_\_\_\_

FY03: \_\_\_\_\_ FY04: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

ii. \_\_\_\_\_

FY03: \_\_\_\_\_ FY04: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

iii. \_\_\_\_\_

FY03: \_\_\_\_\_ FY04: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**4. If your agency answered “0” to any part of Question 3(A-H) above, please check the response(s) below that best describe the reasons, and include explanatory comments:**

- **\_\_\_ Agency did not enter into contracts for which partnering or other forms of ADR were needed. Comments:**

\_\_\_\_\_

- **\_\_\_ Agency did not have issues, conflicts, or litigation that were appropriate to address through ADR. Comments:**

\_\_\_\_\_

- **\_\_\_ Agency did not have means of accessing needed ADR services or neutrals. Comments:**

\_\_\_\_\_

- **\_\_\_ Other (please describe):**\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. **Trained Employee Neutrals.** VADRA's Interagency Advisory Council is creating a shared pool of neutrals whose services could be provided to state agencies at little or no cost. This pool would cover a broad range of governmental functions, including but not limited to contract disputes, regulation, enforcement, licensing, permitting, policymaking, and intergovernmental relations. *We need your help in identifying potential employee resources to accomplish this goal.*

Please provide the following information for each employee in your agency who has been trained or is experienced as a *mediator* and/or *facilitator*,\*\* and who may be willing and available to provide services to another state agency upon request, as his/her work schedule permits:

- **Full Name**
- **Work Phone Number**
- **Work Email Address**
- **How Trained or Experienced (as mediator, facilitator, or both)**

\*\* *Mediator* means a neutral who assists parties in conflict in exploring their differences, identifying key issues, and developing a mutually agreeable resolution to their dispute.

*Facilitator* means a neutral who assists a group of stakeholders achieve identified goals involving complex, often controversial issues, through a managed group discussion process and collaborative decision-making.

**How This Information Will Be Used:** The Interagency Advisory Council will combine the information provided through this survey with lists of “pro bono” and state employee neutrals currently serving specialized ADR programs such as the Department of Employment Dispute Resolution’s workplace mediation program, and the Department of Professional & Occupational Regulation’s consumer/contractor mediation program. The Council will then develop “cross-training” programs for the identified employee resources within state agencies, which will result in more low-cost, “in-house” ADR providers with specialized training to meet the various functional needs of state government.

**Thanks for your assistance with this survey!**